

EXHIBIT C

1 COOLEY LLP
 2 BOBBY GHAJAR (198719)
 (bghajar@cooley.com)
 3 COLETTE GHAZARIAN (322235)
(cghazarian@cooley.com)
 4 1333 2nd Street, Suite 400
Santa Monica, California 90401
 Telephone: (310) 883-6400
 5 MARK WEINSTEIN (193043)
(mweinstein@cooley.com)
 6 KATHLEEN HARTNETT (314267)
(khartnett@cooley.com)
 7 JUDD LAUTER (290945)
(jlauter@cooley.com)
 8 ELIZABETH L. STAMESHKIN (260865)
(lstameshkin@cooley.com)
 9 3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
 Telephone: (650) 843-5000
 10
 11 CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP
 12 ANGELA L. DUNNING (212047)
(adunning@cgsh.com)
 13 1841 Page Mill Road, Suite 250
Palo Alto, CA 94304
 Telephone: (650) 815-4131
 14
 15 *Counsel for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 RICHARD KADREY, *et al.*,
 20 Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,
 21 v.
 22 META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware
corporation;
 23
 24

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS INC.'S
RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO
PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED NOTICE OF
DEPOSITION PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P.
30(b)(6) TO META PLATFORMS, INC.
(SERVED ON 10/8/24)**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 30 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Meta”) by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby provides the following responses and objections to Plaintiffs Amended Notice of Deposition Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) to Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Notice”) served on October 8, 2024, and the individual numbered topics identified therein (“Topics”), as follows:

I. Objections To Notice and All Topics

Meta makes the following objections to the Notice and all Topics and definitions therein, whether or not separately set forth in response to each Topic or definition:

1. Meta objects to the definition of “Relevant Period” as overbroad, unduly burdensome, unreasonable, and disproportionate to the needs of the case on the ground that it encompasses years prior to any conduct conceivably relevant to Plaintiffs’ allegations. Meta construes the “Relevant Period” to mean January 1, 2022 through the Present.
2. Meta reserves all objections or other questions as to the competency, relevance, materiality, privilege, or admissibility as evidence in any subsequent proceeding in or trial of this or any other action for any purpose whatsoever of Meta’s Response to the Notice and any information, document, or thing identified or provided in response to the Notice.
3. Meta objects to all Topics to the extent that they seek information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or ground for withholding documents or information. Meta will not provide such protected information. Each designee is testifying on behalf of Meta and not in his or her personal capacity to the extent within the scope of the Topics, subject to Defendant’s objections and responses below. Any inadvertent disclosure of any privileged or protected information is not a waiver of any applicable privilege or protection. Meta expressly reserves the right to object to the introduction at trial or other use of any privileged or otherwise protected information that may be inadvertently disclosed.
4. By stating that Meta will make a witness available on a Topic, Meta does not represent that information exists on such Topic, but rather that Meta will make a reasonable attempt to

1 ascertain whether information concerning the Topic does, in fact, exist, and to prepare a
 2 witness to testify on that Topic to the extent reasonably practicable, based on a reasonable
 3 investigation under the circumstances. Meta has no obligation to create new documents,
 4 information, or analysis in response to this Notice. Nor does Meta have an obligation to
 5 obtain information from sources beyond its control that are equally accessible to Plaintiffs.

- 6 5. To the extent the Notice uses capitalized letters in suggesting that a term or phrase is
 defined, but for which no definition is provided, Meta objects to those terms or phrases as
 vague, ambiguous, and overly broad. Meta interprets the capitalized, but undefined terms
 “Meta LLMs,” “Meta’s LLMs,” “Meta AI products” to have the same meaning as “Meta
 Language Models,” defined below in Objection 8.
- 11 6. Meta objects to all definitions and Topics to the extent they seek to require Meta to search
 for information about documents no longer in existence or no longer in Meta’s possession,
 custody, or control on the grounds that they are overly broad, would subject Meta to undue
 annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense, and seek to impose upon Meta an obligation
 to investigate information or materials from third parties or services who are equally
 accessible to Plaintiffs.
- 17 7. Meta objects to the Notice to the extent it seeks to define terms and/or characterize the
 evidence in this matter. Nothing in this response should be construed as an admission of
 18 any facts or assumptions advanced by Plaintiffs in the Notice.
- 20 8. The term “Meta Language Models,” as used by Meta herein, shares the same meaning as
 Meta’s definition of the term in Meta’s objections and responses to Plaintiffs’ discovery
 21 requests, i.e. models within the Llama family of LLMs that have been publicly released by
 22 Meta, namely, Llama 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, and Llama 3.

24 **II. Specific Objections And Responses**

25 Without waiving or limiting in any manner any of the foregoing objections, but rather
 26 incorporating them into each of the following responses to the extent applicable, Meta responds to
 27 the specific Topics as follows:

28

1 **Topic No. 1:**

2 Meta's access to, identification of, assembly, processing, and/or curation of datasets to train
 3 its Large Language Models, including Meta's gathering of works, including copyrighted works,
 4 from websites for potential use and/or use as data for training, testing, validating, and/or
 5 benchmarking, including but not limited to "shadow library" websites like Z-Lib, Library Genesis
 6 ("LibGen"), Bibliotik, and Anna's Archive.

7 **Response to Topic No. 1:**

8 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 9 on the following grounds:

10 1) The terms "access to," "identification of," "curation," "datasets," "Large Language
 11 Models," "validating," "benchmarking," "gathering of works," "copyrighted works," and "shadow
 12 library" are vague, ambiguous, and undefined. Meta construes this Topic as referring to Meta's
 13 selection, downloading, assembly, and processing of text datasets used to train the Meta Language
 14 Models.

15 2) The Topic seeks information that is not or no longer in Meta's possession, considering
 16 that several individuals involved in the selection and processing of certain datasets are no longer
 17 employed at Meta.

18 3) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 19 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 20 privileges.

21 4) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the
 22 needs of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad
 23 and unduly burdensome (e.g., the notion that a corporate witness would be responsible for testifying
 24 as to the historical minutiae of every text training dataset).

25 5) To the extent that Plaintiffs are contending that any particular material is protected by
 26 copyright, this Topic calls for a legal conclusion and seeks information outside of Meta's
 27 possession, custody, or control.

28

1 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 2 witnesses to testify generally regarding Meta's selection, downloading, assembly, and processing
 3 of text datasets used to pretrain the Meta Language Models .

4 **Topic No. 2:**

5 Meta's access, copying, reproduction and/or use of the datasets, including the datasets
 6 commonly known as "Books3" (or "b3g"), "The Pile," "LibGen," and the "Fair Use Library"; the
 7 individuals who accessed or made these copies or reproductions; the storage of these copies or
 8 reproductions; the content of these datasets; and Meta's communications with the creators of and/or
 9 individuals who control or maintain these datasets.

10 **Response to Topic No. 2:**

11 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 12 on the following grounds:

13 1) The term "access" and the phrases "the datasets," "individuals who accessed or made
 14 these copies or reproductions," "copies and reproductions," and "individuals who control or
 15 maintain these datasets" are vague, ambiguous, and undefined. Meta construes "access" to refer to
 16 downloading; "the datasets" to refer to text datasets used to pretrain the Meta Language Models;
 17 "copies and reproductions" to refer to copies made by Meta for purposes of pretraining the Meta
 18 Language Models, and "individuals who control or maintain these datasets" to refer to unidentified
 19 third parties.

20 2) The Topic seeks information that is not or no longer in Meta's possession, considering
 21 that several individuals involved in Meta's downloading and reproduction of these datasets are no
 22 longer employed at Meta and such information was not kept in the ordinary course of business.

23 3) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 24 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 25 privileges.

26 4) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 27 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and

28

1 unduly burdensome (e.g., the notion that a corporate witness would be responsible for testifying as
 2 to every ablation experiment).

3 5) To the extent the Topic seeks information concerning the contents or creation of datasets
 4 not created by Meta such information is equally accessible to Plaintiffs.

5 6) This Topic is duplicative of Topic 1.

6 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 7 witnesses to testify generally regarding Meta's use, if any, of the datasets commonly known as
 8 "Books3" (or "b3g"), "The Pile," "LibGen," and the "Fair Use Library"; the individual employees
 9 or contractors of Meta who accessed or made copies or reproductions of such datasets; the general
 10 contents of any datasets used by Meta; the storage by Meta of any copies or reproductions; and
 11 Meta's communications, if any, with the creators of and/or individuals who control or maintain
 12 these datasets.

13 **Topic No. 3:**

14 The Meta LLMs trained on material and/or datasets obtained and/or accessed from public
 15 websites, including any material sourced from "Books3," "The Pile," and "Library Genesis," and
 16 including how Meta trains subsequent versions of its LLMs using training data from prior versions,
 17 whether Meta may or does remove training data from LLMs, and whether Meta still accesses or
 18 otherwise uses these datasets for LLM training purposes, or if not, why it no longer accesses or
 19 uses these datasets.

20 **Response to Topic No. 3:**

21 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 22 on the following grounds:

23 1) The terms "Meta LLMs," "material sourced from" and "accessed" and the phrase "trains
 24 subsequent versions of its LLMs using earlier versions" are vague, ambiguous, and
 25 undefined. Meta construes "material sourced from" to mean text data copied or reproduced from
 26 the designated locations, "accessed" to mean downloaded, "Meta LLMs" to mean "Meta Language
 27 Models" as defined above, and interprets "trains subsequent versions of its LLMs using earlier
 28 versions" to refer to prior versions of training datasets.

1 2) The Topic seeks information that is not or no longer in Meta's possession, considering
 2 that several individuals involved in Meta's downloading of certain datasets are no longer employed
 3 at Meta, certain datasets were downloaded years ago, and such information was not kept in the
 4 ordinary course of business.

5 3) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 6 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 7 unduly burdensome (e.g., it goes beyond the Meta Language Models at issue in this suit and
 8 purports to require Meta to go prepare a witness to testify on conduct having no bearing on the
 9 works at issue in this case).

10 4) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 11 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 12 privileges.

13 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 14 witnesses to testify regarding the identification of the Meta Language Models, if any, that were
 15 trained on material sourced from "Books3," "The Pile," and "Library Genesis," if/how Meta trains
 16 subsequent versions of the Meta Language Models using training data from prior versions, whether
 17 Meta may or does remove training data from Meta Language Models, and whether Meta still
 18 accesses or otherwise uses Books3," "The Pile," or "Library Genesis" for training purposes, or if
 19 not, why it no longer does so.

20 **Topic No. 4:**

21 Meta's knowledge that its LLM training datasets included copyrighted material, including
 22 any discussions or deliberations regarding the same; any discussions, deliberations, or efforts to
 23 mitigate potential copyright infringement relating to Meta's LLMs; and any steps Meta has taken
 24 to train or otherwise program its LLMs not to output infringing material.

25 **Response to Topic No. 4:**

26 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 27 on the following grounds:

28

1 1) The terms “Meta’s LLMs,” “LLM training datasets” and “copyrighted material” are
 2 vague, ambiguous, and undefined. Meta construes “Meta’s LLMs” to mean the Meta Language
 3 Models as defined above, “LLM training datasets” to refer to datasets used to pretrain the Meta
 4 Language Models, and “copyrighted material” to refer to material that is subject to copyright
 5 protection under U.S. law.

6 2) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 7 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 8 unduly burdensome (e.g., it goes beyond the Meta Language Models at issue in this suit and
 9 purports to require Meta to go prepare a witness to testify regarding “any discussions, deliberations,
 10 or efforts” concerning the Topic).

11 3) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 12 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 13 privileges.

14 4) 2) To the extent that Plaintiffs are contending that any particular material is protected by
 15 copyright, this Topic calls for a legal conclusion and seeks information outside of Meta’s
 16 possession, custody, or control.

17 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 18 witnesses to testify generally regarding Meta’s knowledge of whether certain datasets used to
 19 pretrain the Meta Language Models contain material that is protected by copyright under U.S. law
 20 and Meta’s efforts to reduce the possibility, if any, that the models can reproduce verbatim content
 21 contained within training data.

22 **Topic No. 5:**

23 Meta’s policies and procedures regarding its adherence to any laws or regulations, including
 24 the EU AI Act, that require transparency around the datasets used to train AI models, require
 25 authorization from rightsholders for the use of the text and data in training AI models, and require
 26 disclosure of the use of any copyrighted materials to train an AI model.

27

28

1 **Response to Topic No. 5:**

2 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Defendant objects to this
3 Topic on the following grounds:

4 1) The term “copyrighted materials,” “transparency,” “authorization,” and “rightsholders”
5 are vague, ambiguous, and undefined. Meta construes “copyrighted materials” to refer to material
6 that is subject to copyright protection under U.S. law. The remaining terms are legal concepts, the
7 definition of which would require Meta to make a legal judgment and divulge information which
8 is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine.

9 2) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
10 work product doctrine and Defendant does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive
11 those privileges.

12 3) The Topic improperly purports to characterize the requirements of the EU AI Act.

13 4) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
14 of the case, as Meta’s response to recently enacted foreign regulations is irrelevant to the issues in
15 dispute under U.S. law.

16 Meta will not designate a witness on this Topic.

17 **Topic No. 6:**

18 All internal policies, including approval policies, relating to Meta’s access and/or use of
19 datasets, including the "Books3," "The Pile," and "LibGen" datasets, for any purpose relating to
20 the development of Meta’s AI technology.

21 **Response to Topic No. 6:**

22 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Metaobjects to this Topic
23 on the following grounds:

24 1) The phrase “internal policies” and terms “datasets” and “Meta’s AI technology” are
25 vague and ambiguous— Meta construes this Topic as seeking information concerning Meta’s
26 policies for obtaining approval to use text datasets used to pretrain the Meta Language Models.

1 2) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 2 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 3 privileges.

4 3) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 5 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 6 unduly burdensome (e.g., it goes beyond the Meta Language Models at issue in this suit and
 7 purports to obligate a corporate witness to testify as to every internal policy during the relevant
 8 period that may relate to use of datasets).

9 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 10 witnesses to testify generally regarding Meta's policies for obtaining approval to use text datasets
 11 used to pretrain the Meta Language Models.

12 **Topic No. 7:**

13 The origin and contents of the datasets Meta has produced in this case, labeled
 14 Meta_Kadrey_Data_001, Meta_Kadrey_Data_002, Meta_Kadrey_Data_003,
 15 Meta_Kadrey_Data_004, and Meta_Kadrey_Data_005, including who identified and compiled
 16 each dataset produced, and how each dataset produced has been used by Meta in training each of
 17 its LLMs from Llama 1 through any Llama version currently in development, including whether
 18 Meta accessed, obtained and/or sourced the datasets at multiple points in time and, if so, when and
 19 for what purpose.

20 **Response to Topic No. 7:**

21 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 22 on the following grounds:

23 1) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 24 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 25 unduly burdensome (e.g., the notion that a corporate witness would be responsible for testifying as
 26 to the specific contents of terabytes of data, let alone the extent to which data has been downloaded
 27 multiple times).

1 2) The Topic seeks information that is not or no longer in Meta's possession, considering
 2 that several individuals involved in the selection and downloading of certain datasets are no longer
 3 employed at Meta.

4 3) The identified datasets are within the possession of Plaintiffs and therefore equally
 5 accessible to Plaintiffs.

6 4) This Topic is duplicative of Topics 1, 2, and 3.

7 5) The terms "origin and contents of the datasets Meta has produced in this case" and "who
 8 identified and compiled each dataset produced" are vague, ambiguous, undefined, and
 9 nonsensical. Meta interprets this Topic to seek information on the third party source(s) from which
 10 Meta copied or reproduced text datasets used to pretrain the Meta Language Models and
 11 subsequently produced in this case, and the employees at Meta who originally identified and
 12 compiled those text datasets for that pretraining.

13 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 14 witnesses to testify generally regarding the origin of the datasets Meta has produced in this case,
 15 labeled Meta_Kadrey_Data_001, Meta_Kadrey_Data_002, Meta_Kadrey_Data_003,
 16 Meta_Kadrey_Data_004, and Meta_Kadrey_Data_005, how each dataset produced has been used
 17 by Meta in training the Meta Language Models, including, generally, whether Meta downloaded
 18 the datasets at multiple points in time.

19 **Topic No. 8:**

20 Meta's communications including discussions, deliberations, and negotiations concerning
 21 each and every dataset regardless of the source, type, or potential use that may or could have been
 22 used in training generative AI products (whether or not related only to Meta products) or for use in
 23 any other Meta AI product, other than generative AI, including but not limited to, all such
 24 discussions referenced in the April 6, 2024 New York Times article, "How Tech Giants Cut Corners
 25 to Harvest Data for A.I." or the September 25, 2024 The Verge article and interview, "Why Mark
 26 Zuckerberg thinks AR glasses will replace your phone." Some examples that are obvious may
 27 include actual or potential licensing deals related to Meta's AI assistant, or actual or potential
 28 licensing deals related to Meta's AI instant video generator, regardless of whether they resulted in

1 actual licensing deals. This topic includes all communications related to these discussions,
 2 deliberations, negotiations and or attempts by Meta or other generative AI companies that may have
 3 been discussed by Meta that did not result in an executed licensing agreement with a third party.

4 **Response to Topic No. 8:**

5 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 6 on the following grounds:

7 1) The phrase “generative AI products (whether or not related only to Meta products)” and
 8 “Meta AI product” are vague and ambiguous. Meta construes this Topic to concern the Meta
 9 Language Models.

10 2) The reference to “discussions referenced” in the April 6, 2024 New York Times article
 11 is vague and ambiguous, as any such discussions are not identified with particularity such that Meta
 12 can determine who participated in them and when. And even if Meta could do so, such discussions
 13 purportedly occurred 1.5 years ago.

14 3) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 15 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 16 privileges.

17 4) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 18 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 19 unduly burdensome (e.g., the Topic seeks information concerning generative AI solutions other
 20 than the Meta Language Models and datasets for other types of AI models such as video; and the
 21 Topic seeks “discussions... concerning each and every dataset,” irrespective of whether Meta ever
 22 used or considered using it).

23 5) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 24 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 25 privileges.

26 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 27 witnesses to testify generally regarding Meta’s efforts to acquire text data to train the Meta
 28 Language Models, including licensing efforts, if any.

1 **Topic No. 9:**

2 Financial information about the Llama models' actual and expected revenue and profit
 3 impacts, including Meta's understanding of the actual and expected financial impact its AI
 4 technology will have on Meta's various commercial product lines, including Facebook, Instagram,
 5 Facebook Reels, and WhatsApp.

6 **Response to Topic No. 9:**

7 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 8 on the following grounds: The phrases "AI technology," and "expected revenue and profit
 9 impacts," and "various commercial product lines" are vague and ambiguous—Meta construes "AI
 10 technology" to refer to the Meta Language Models, "expected revenue and profit impacts" to refer
 11 to revenue and profit projections, and "various commercial product lines" to refer to those
 12 specifically listed: Facebook, Instagram, Facebook Reels, and WhatsApp.

13 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 14 witnesses to testify generally regarding projections, if any, of revenue and profits from the Meta
 15 Language Models, if any, including Meta's understanding of any financial impact the Meta
 16 Language Models are expected to have on Facebook, Instagram, Facebook Reels, and WhatsApp.

17 **Topic No. 10:**

18 The source code provided to Plaintiffs for review, including who compiled the source code;
 19 what the source code consists of; any source code repositories used by Meta's LLMs not captured
 20 by the production to date; the dates the source code was created; how recently the source code has
 21 been updated; what LLM models the source code covers; how the source code is organized; what
 22 models are used within each version of Llama and what each of these models do; whether any
 23 Llama model uses or incorporates different tools, including for web research, and if so, what these
 24 tools do; differentiations between the model production system on the web versus what Meta has
 25 shared in its public repositories; source code pertaining to Meta's efforts to train its models to
 26 identify copyrighted material; whether there are any pull requests or commits from certain date
 27 ranges that are not included in the source code; whether the source code produced to date includes
 28

1 or omits production or application code; and any of the issues raised in the October 4, 2024
 2 Declaration of Dr. Jonathan Krein.

3 **Response to Topic No. 10:**

4 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 5 on the following grounds:

6 1) The Topic improperly seeks discovery on discovery.

7 2) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 8 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 9 unduly burdensome (e.g., it has no bearing on the issues in dispute).

10 3) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 11 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 12 unduly burdensome. For example, this Topic encompasses detailed information about each of tens
 13 of thousands of source code-related files, including revision histories, created as a result of efforts
 14 of a large number of individuals at Meta taking place over an extended period of time. It is not
 15 possible as a practical matter to prepare a human being to testify as a Rule 30(b)(6) designee about
 16 the breadth of information encompassed by this Topic.

17 4) The Topic is also vague and ambiguous as to the phrases, “production or application
 18 code,” and as such, Meta has interpreted this phrase as referring to code for the “Meta AI” large
 19 language model available as a web application. The Topic is also vague and ambiguous as to “any
 20 source code repositories used by Meta’s LLMs,” and as such, Meta has interpreted this phrase as
 21 referring to source code repositories for the pre-training and post-training of the Meta Language
 22 Models.

23 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 24 witnesses to testify generally regarding the source code and source code repositories provided to
 25 Plaintiffs for review, including generally the purpose and functionality each repository provides,
 26 the identity of source code repositories if any for Meta Language Models that were not included in
 27 the discovery production to date, pull requests or commits (if any) not included in the discovery

28

1 production to date, and generally the differences if any between source code repositories used by
 2 the Llama models versus the Meta AI web-based model.

3 **Topic No. 11:**

4 Meta's process for identifying and collecting documents in response to Plaintiffs' RFPs,
 5 including data sources reviewed, non-custodial files reviewed, search terms used, date ranges
 6 applied, metadata collection and capabilities concerning what metadata may be collected, and
 7 Meta's policies and practices relating to labeling internal documents "attorney-client privileged" or
 8 the equivalent.

9 **Response to Topic No. 11:**

10 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 11 on the following grounds:

12 1) The Topic improperly seeks discovery on discovery.

13 2) The Topic seeks discovery on information that is not relevant or proportional to the needs
 14 of the case, nor a proper subject for a 30(b)(6) deposition, because the Topic is overly broad and
 15 unduly burdensome (e.g., it has no bearing on the issues in dispute).

16 3) The Topic seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney
 17 work product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those
 18 privileges.

19 Meta will not designate a witness on this Topic.

20 **Topic No. 12:**

21 The factual bases and any other supporting analysis for Meta's October 30, 2023 submission
 22 to the U.S. Copyright Office contending that its use of copyrighted material to train its LLMs is
 23 either non-infringing or otherwise constitutes "fair use."

24 **Response to Topic No. 12:**

25 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 26 on the ground that it seeks testimony protected by attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work
 27 product doctrine and Meta does not intend to disclose privileged information or waive those

28

1 privileges. Meta further objects on the ground that any non-privileged “factual bases” for the
 2 submission are set out in the submission itself.

3 Meta will not designate a witness on this Topic.

4 **Topic No. 13:**

5 Meta’s current or future intention to carry out the guidance from Meta’s CEO, Mark
 6 Zuckerberg, that if content creators do not want their content used to train Meta’s LLMs, then Meta
 7 will stop training its LLMs on their content. This topic includes the means and methods by which
 8 Meta would stop training its LLMs on certain creators’ content, how creators would opt-out, as
 9 well as any analysis Meta has done regarding the effects an opt-out system would have on its LLMs,
 10 including their efficacy.

11 **Response to Topic No. 13:**

12 In addition to the foregoing objections applicable to all Topics, Meta objects to this Topic
 13 on the ground that the Topic mischaracterizes statements made by Mark Zuckerberg, namely, by
 14 suggesting that Mr. Zuckerberg has provided guidance that Meta will stop training its large
 15 language models on creator content upon request.

16 Subject to and without waiving any of these objections, Meta will designate one or more
 17 witnesses to testify regarding Meta’s plans, if any, to carry out purported guidance from Mark
 18 Zuckerberg, if any, to cease training future large language models on content in response to requests
 19 by the creators of such content, and any non-privileged analysis of the effects, if any, of such plans
 20 on the Meta Language Models or their efficacy.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Dated: October 28, 2024

COOLEY LLP

2 By: /s/ Judd Lauter

3 Bobby Ghajar
4 Mark Weinstein
5 Kathleen Hartnett
6 Judd Lauter
7 Liz Stameshkin
8 Colette Ghazarian

9 CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN &
10 HAMILTON LLP
11 Angela L. Dunning

12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 META PLATFORMS, INC.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California. I am employed in Santa Clara County, State of California, in the office of a member of the bar of this Court, at whose direction the service was made. I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, California 94304-1130. On the date set forth below I served the documents described below in the manner described below:

- DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS INC.’S RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS’ AMENDED NOTICE OF DEPOSITION PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 30(b)(6) TO META PLATFORMS, INC.

(BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) I am personally and readily familiar with the business practice of Cooley LLP for the preparation and processing of documents in portable document format (PDF) for e-mailing, and I caused said documents to be prepared in PDF and then served by electronic mail to the parties listed below.

on the following part(ies) in this action:

Executed October 28, 2024, at Palo Alto, California.

 Jessica G. Alvarez-Lopez

1
2 Joseph R. Saveri
3 Cadio Zirpoli
4 Christopher K.L. Young
Holden Benon
Louis Andrew Kessler
Aaron Cera
Margaux Poueymirou
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1000
San Francisco, CA 94108
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czipoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
lkessler@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

12 Matthew Butterick
**MATTHEW BUTTERICK,
ATTORNEY AT LAW**
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, #406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

16 *Attorneys for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

18 Bryan L. Clobes (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Alexander J. Sweatman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Mohammed Rathur
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

24 *Attorneys for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

SERVICE LIST

Joshua I. Schiller, Esq.
Maxwell Vaughn Pritt, Esq.
BOIES SCHILLE FLEXNER
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Email: jischiller@bsflp.com
mpritt@bsflp.com

David Boise, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
Email: dboies@bsflp.com

Jesse Panuccio (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER
1401 New York Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20005
Email: jpanuccio@bsflp.com

*Attorneys for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

Brian O'Mara
DiCELLO LEVITT LLP
4747 Executive Drive, Suite 240
San Diego, CA 92121
Email: BrianO@dicellosevitt.com

Amy Keller (admitted *pro hac vice*)
James A. Ulwick (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Nada Djordjevic (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DiCELLO LEVITT LLP
10 North Dearborn St., Sixth Floor
Chicago, IL 60602
Email: akeller@dicellosevitt.com
julwick@dicellosevitt.com
ndjordjevic@dicellosevitt.com

David A. Straite (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DiCELLO LEVITT LLP
485 Lexington Avenue, Suite 1001
New York, NY 10017
Email: dstraite@dicellosevitt.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst

1 Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq.
 2 Daniel M. Hutchinson, Esq.
 3 Reilly T. Stoler, Esq.
 4 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**
 5 **BERNSTEIN, LLP**
 6 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
 7 Telephone: (415) 956-1000
 Email: ecabraser@lchb.com
 dhutchinson@lchb.com
 rstoler@lchb.com

8 Rachel Geman
 9 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**
 10 **BERNSTEIN, LLP**
 11 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor
 New York, New York 10013-1413
 12 Telephone: (212) 355-9500
 Email: rgeman@lchb.com

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff *Christopher Farnsworth*
 and Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed
 Class

Nancy Evelyn Wolff
COWAN DEBAETS ABRAHAMS &
SHEPPARD LLP
 9454 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 901
 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
 Telephone: (310) 340-6334
 Fax: (310) 492-4394
 Email: NWolff@cdas.com

Scott J. Sholder
 CeCe M. Cole
COWAN DEBAETS ABRAHAMS &
SHEPPARD LLP
 60 Broad Street, 30th Floor
 New York, New York 10004
 Telephone: (212) 974-7474
 Email: ssholder@cdas.com
 ccole@cdas.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff *Christopher Farnsworth*
 and Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed
 Class

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28